

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98144
Title of the Manuscript:	Essential oils: an ecofriendly approach for plant pest and disease management
Type of the Article	Literature Review

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, an important part of any research is the literature review. Essential oils are a promising area and a literature review on this topic is of great importance to the scientific community. 2. I suggest that it be included in the title that it is a literature review 3. Yes 4. As it is a literature review, the subtopics present in "Extraction methods of essential oils" should contain more references 5. Yes, although more references are needed to support the subtopics addressed 6. No, although recent, it needs more references. Topics with only 1 or 2 references are poorly supported.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes	
Optional/General comments	This is a valid and promising theme, the data presented are mostly well supported, despite the need for further deepening in some points.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iara Maria dos Santos Costa Luna
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Alagoas, Brazil